

**Minutes of Meeting
Grafton Planning Board
Monday, May 18, 2015**

RECEIVED TOWN CLERK
GRAFTON, MA

2015 JUN 10 PM 12 36

A regular meeting of the Grafton Planning Board was held on May 18, 2015 in Conference Room A at the Grafton Municipal Center, 30 Providence Road, Grafton, MA. Present for the meeting were Chairman David Robbins, Vice-Chair Michael Scully, Robert Hassinger, Sargon Hanna and Linda Hassinger. Staff present: Town Planner Joe Laydon, Assistant Town Planner Ann Morgan and Office Manager Nicole Larson.

Chairman Robbins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. PUBLIC INPUT

No public input at this time.

ACTION ITEM 2A: RELEASE OF BOND – GCCF NEW ENGLAND d/b/a CUMBERLAND FARMS – 217 WORCESTER STREET, NORTH GRAFTON

Mr. Laydon stated the Board required a landscaping bond to ensure the installation of several final elements to the project, specifically landscaping, plant placement and plant size. After a site visit last week, Mr. Laydon found the hydro-seed was dispersed and beginning to take root, landscaping was installed according to plan, and the final coat of pavement was installed.

Mr. Laydon confirmed that all elements of the Board's requirements for release have been met. The building inspector, Bob Berger, is requesting as-built drawings to ensure that the sign's height and dimensions are within regulation guidelines. Mr. Laydon suggested that this topic is outside the specifics of this particular bond and finalization of sign dimensions would be reviewed in the building department and, for this reason, he is recommending that the Planning Board release the bond.

Mr. Scully requested an update on the lighting wattage and the audio levels at the site. Mr. Laydon confirmed that the intensity of wattage was in question, and confirmation can be requested through the building department by way of electrical permitting. He also reported that he did not observe any audio or visual playback at the time of his site visit last week, as outlined by the Planning Board's guidelines and mentioned at the public hearing. Mr. Scully reiterated abutter's concerns about the location of the lighting and audio, to which the Board agreed that the correct path for any violations of visual and audio playback would have to be presented by way of complaints.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger, **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna to find that the outstanding work items are deemed complete and to authorize the release of the bond. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

ACTION ITEM 2B: DRAFT DECISION – MAJOR RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL PERMIT (MSP 2014-8) – BULL MEADOW, LLC – GORDON LEWIS, MANAGER (APPLICANT/OWNER)

The Board reviewed the draft decision and made some corrections to the text. Ann Morgan, the Assistant Planner, brought to the Board's attention a few grammatical errors that needed be corrected in the existing text. The Board also requested some conditions and findings to be reworded in order to clarify the Board's intent.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger, **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna to make favorable findings for F1 - F37 with modifications as discussed. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

Mr. Hassinger noted that special consideration should be taken particularly when referencing conditional requirements pertaining to the preservation of vegetation and trees of which provide screening and buffering to the site. Mr. Laydon noted that the Board didn't discuss screening or buffering as part of the Special Permit process because it would make the requirement of screening and buffering an active process, instead of passively preserving vegetation of an existing space. Mr. Robbins noted that as the Board would have the opportunity to review, discuss these issues with the Applicant at the definitive plan stage. Also, once the definitive plan is in place, the conditions will speak clearly to the matters of screening and buffering. Mr. Hassinger referenced the bylaws to determine that the decision should be based on findings, even if the finding is that the subject matter is not applicable. If that is the case, the decision should include conditional requirements, of which could be better referenced at the definitive stage of the permitting. Mr. Laydon noted that there are currently conditions included for retention of vegetation and trees.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger, **SECOND** by Mrs. Hassinger to make favorable findings for F38 through F44 with modifications as discussed and in particular finding #F38. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

When discussing the conditions of the decision, Mr. Hassinger asked to expand Condition #C7 to include language that speaks directly to the type, dimensions, character, amount and location when referring to the buffering of the property. These additions will reference 1.5.5.D. The Board and the Town Planner discussed and agreed upon revised language for Condition #C7.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger. **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna to grant the decision as drafted including conditions C1 – C20, with modifications as discussed. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger. **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna to authorize the Town Planner sign the Decision, with noted revisions, on behalf of the Board. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

**PUBLIC HEARING 9A: CONTINUATION OF HEARING – MAJOR RESIDENTIAL
SPECIAL PERMIT (MRSP 2014-10) – “VILLAGE AT INSTITUTE ROAD”
SUBDIVISION - D. & F. AFONSO BUILDERS (APPLICANT/OWNER)**

Mr. Hanna read the meeting notice and Chairman Robbins opened the public hearing. Present for the hearing was Normand Gamache, representing the Applicant and Erica Guidoboni, traffic consultant for Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. Mr. Gamache provided a brief update on the work to date since the last time this project came before the Board.

Through the course of meeting with the State Legislature, the Town Planner, Mr. Laydon, has proposed the need for laying out of a right of way for Institute Road which was declared a Town road by the courts. The State is continuing to work with the Town on this matter. During the course of the public hearing, the following issues were discussed:

- Mr. Robbins pointed out while the courts declared this is a public road way that no right of way with defined boundaries had been approved. Though it is a public way, the Town does not have established rights with regards to easements and established right of way. He noted that the next step is to move forward in establishing boundaries for this road way, which the legislature routinely issues across the State, at the request of local government. Once the State agrees to grant a right of way for Institute Road, any future issues would be the responsibility of the Town; hence it is favorable that the right of way for the road be sorted prior to issuing this major residential special permit request. Once the right of way is agreed upon, it will allow for a better understanding of the design work needed.
- The time line for the approval for the requested right of way is dependent on a separate State matter along Institute. The State's Department of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) has proposed to construct a fire access road for the Department of Youth Services (DYS) property east of this site. This is a process routinely conducted by the State. Mr. Laydon noted that the Legislature is expected to take only a few months to act on this matter and he did not foresee any interference from the State on this local matter of development, granted no issues are found on the local level. He will continue to coordinate efforts with Senator Moore and Representative Muradian.
- Mr. Laydon also noted that moving forward, special care must be taken in respect to public safety when working with DCAMM in order to get a true road alignment for the fire access as well as preservation of a vernal pool adjacent to the roadway. Mr. Gamache stated his confidence that their most recent design request will be granted by DCAMM, allowing for the 25' easement off the center of the road in each direction with an additional 30 foot right of way to satisfy any further grading of the road. He noted that they their layout is designed to accommodate a 35mph design criteria. The Board agreed that in obtaining at least a 50 foot right of way, Institute Road will best suited for the anticipated needs of additional traffic levels. Mr. Hassinger pointed out that requirements for providing cross sections must be met in the future.
- During a site visit with the Police Chief, concerns were raised relating to the speed of traffic coming up and over the crest of Institute Road in the vicinity of the proposed entrance to the proposed subdivision Road A. The Board discussed the need for a 100 foot slope transition to improve the level of safety by way of extending the line of sight. Increasing right of way lay out on Institute Road to a 60' feet would likely provide for any future traffic needs.
- There is a public safety concern due to the width and placement of Institute Road with in the right of way once that right of way is established. The Planning Board will be requesting the assistance and input from the Town's fire and police departments on this matter as needed.
- The Board also discussed the need to take into consideration the driveway for the ANR lot which has a direct access on to Institute Road. Mr. Laydon suggested that there may

be an opportunity to find an alternate entrance for that lot by way of the proposed subdivision roadway. The specifics of the Institute Road design, particularly pertaining to slope and grade will be further discussed after the right of way is officially granted by the state.

- There is a vernal pool alongside Institute Road just north of the ANR lot, adjacent to the previously discussed hazardous crest in the road. Being that this area is protected by environmental restrictions, the ability to make changes in this area may be limited.
- Mr. Laydon discussed the availability of open space and suggested that the plan for the MRSP include two access points to areas adjacent to the site. A potential foot path accessing the Office / Light Industrial (OLI) area adjacent to the proposed development to the north could be beneficial to future residents if that area is developed into commercial space sometime in the future. And additional foot path to the Town owned land to the west of the site would provide access to open space and recreation opportunities. The Board agreed that leaving two corridors for potential foot paths to adjacent properties is preferable.
- Mr. Scully noted that adjacent to the proposed lots 13 & 14 lies Town owned property which borders the North Street Elementary School. He suggested that a foot path be created which could then be used as a possible evacuation route for the school during an emergency situation. Students and staff could evacuate along the path to the proposed subdivision where buses would be waiting. This idea would require bus access in the development as well as a formalized and maintained foot path.

In order to speak to the concern raised at the last hearing regarding traffic level increase, a traffic study was conducted by Greenman-Petersen. Erica Guidoboni of Greenman-Petersen reviewed the data collected and discussed the following points on traffic flow, particularly at the intersection of Westboro Road and Institute Road:

- The current use for Institute Road shows traffic count of 1400 cars per day. Mr. Gamache noted that they were planning to design the roadway to a Minor Road C classification. Mr. Hassinger pointed out that the additional volume from the proposed subdivision would require that Institute Road be designed as a Major Road and under the current rules which requires a 60 foot right of way. It was noted that any widening of the roadway and re-grading to eliminate the current crest would result in high rates of travel speed. Institute Road must be designed to anticipate future volumes and use pattern particularly since this is the primary access to the proposed subdivision site.
- Currently Institute Road has one lane for turning right (east) at the intersection of Westboro Road. The intersection is currently failing primarily during the peak commute hours. With a ten year projection, which would take in to account the proposed development along with the other potential factors for increasing traffic in the area, particularly the train station nearby, that intersection would operate at an F Level of Service. Research by Greenman-Peterson suggests the need for a stacking right lane on Institute Road for cars turning right (east) onto Westboro Road. This could be achieved by designing a right turn lane with a 100 foot stacking lane down Institute Road. By separating the right turning vehicles from the left turning vehicles, this transition lane would improve the level of traffic service from an F to an E, creating a 38 second delay for vehicles traveling north on Institute Road. Mr. Hassinger asked if the intersection

would require rounding of lanes. Mr. Gamache noted that they could design it without roundings.

- Currently the traffic making a left turn on to Institute Road from Westboro Road is functioning at an Level of Service a (LOS A), with a 10 year projection of a LOS B rating of about a 10 second delay. Moving forward, D. & F. Afonso Builders will be including this stacking right turn lane as part of their design plan.

Along with the Major Special Permit for the development, D. & F. Afonso will be requesting two waivers for the project in order to work design the infrastructure of the subdivision roadway. One waiver request is for curbing. The second waiver request is for a cut that will exceed the 6 foot maximum allowance for the subdivision roadway.

The Board discussed the merits of moving forward with granting the Major Residential Special Permit (MRSP) prior to the resolution of the design and right of way acceptance by the State. Mr. Gamache stated his preference to move forward with both processes simultaneously and asked that the Board act on the MRSP stating his belief that all the issues had been addressed during the public hearing. Mr. Hassinger noted that until the necessary legislation is granted by the State to make the discussed improvements on Institute Road allowing for adequate access to the proposed development, the Board cannot approve the MRSP. In order to move forward with this application, the Board will need to see a design proposal of Institute Road which incorporates the discussed improvements and as well as the requested access from the State. Final roadway designs should be incorporated into Applicant's submission which can then be referenced in the conditions for granting of the MRSP.

The Board restated its opinion that Institute Road should be designed based on a Major Road designation and that a 60 foot right of way would be required from the State. Mr. Gamache agreed to submit an updated design plan to the Planning Department and Graves Engineering which illustrate improvements to Institute Road based on the 60 foot roadway request. Mr. Laydon stated that he would continue to work with the State and would further review the issue with Town departments such as Police, Fire, Engineering and Department of Public Works.

No public input was received during the hearing.

MOTION by Mr. Hanna, **SECOND** by Mr. Sully to grant the Applicant's written request to continue the hearing to June 22, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

The Board took a five minute recess. Upon return Chairman Robbins took a moment to welcome Nicole Larson, the new Office Manager hired in the Planning Department who will, among other duties, be taking meeting minutes for the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING 9B: JOINT HEARING

SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2015-6) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – COMMON DRIVEWAY

SCENIC ROAD PERMIT (SRP 2015-1) – 114 MERRIAM ROAD – FRED & MARGOT CHURCHILL (APPLICANT/OWNERS)

Mr. Hanna read the meeting notice and Chairman Robbins opened the public hearing. Present for the hearing was Carl Hultgren of Quinn Engineering on behalf of Fred and Margot Churchill. Mr. Hultgren presented an overview of the applications. It was noted that the site abutted the Foster / Blithewood conservation area, that the site was located within the Miscoe Brook Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), the proximity to the Miscoe Brook and surrounding wetlands, flood zones and flood plain. He noted that they meeting with the Conservation Commission to address all their issues and requirements including storm-water management and wetlands disturbance. Two waivers are being requested.

Mr. Hultgren presented several design plans, of which the latest plan moves from 5 proposed lots to 4 proposed lots, three of which are to be accessed via a common driveway and one lot with access from Merriam Road. The newer plans presented to the Board exhibits the various options for creating a common drive which would least disruptive to the wetlands on the property while still allowing for adequate fire safety access to each of the properties with a straight forward ability for a fire truck to make a completed turn around.

The newest plan requires a waiver for an additional 175 feet to the length of the common driveway due to the unique situation and environmental factors that this case embraces. The plan has been reviewed by the Fire Department and is preferred over previous designs. The Fire Department prefers a plan which allows for a location closer to the house lots which would allow for adequate truck turning. This requires a design that necessitates a waiver. The Applicant is further requesting a waiver for a traffic study, as the proposed development plans of 4 lots does not greatly increase the traffic level on Merriam Road. Mr. Hanna asked if a plan could be designed to avoid the request of any waivers. Mr. Hultgren stated that they couldn't give the location of the wetlands, other significant environmental constraints and fire emergency access preferences per the Fire Department.

As part of the site plan, Mr. Hultgren is proposing 2 curb cuts. One cut would be required for the common driveway which would necessitate a 38 foot disturbance in the stone wall and removal of two pine trees along Merriam Road. These alterations are the subject of the Scenic Road Permit request. Upon review the Board determined to be rather modest trees, with no substantial contribution to the overall scenic condition of roadway. The other cut would act as driveway access for lot D which would require rounding to accommodate fire access. The cut for Lot D would require an 18 foot break in the stone wall. All stones removed would be repurposed to repair a segment of the wall, which was previously used as tractor access by the owner, and to repairing other areas where the wall has since deteriorated. Ms. Morgan noted that staff had reviewed the proposed alterations with the Tree Warden who had made a site visit to observe the two trees in question and that he had no objection to the proposed work. Ms. Morgan added that the application was further reviewed by the Historical Commission of which she is a member. The Commission had submitted comments relating the repurposing of the stones from the proposed cuts and the Board should condition the Scenic Road Permit to reinforce that work as proposed by the Applicant. The Commission further had no objections to the removal of the trees as neither one was considered significant or contributing to the scenic road.

Comments from Graves Engineering acknowledged their approval for the said plan for the latest design; however, due to the proximity to a wetlands area, the Conservation Commission's review will have a significant impact on the application in determining if storm water drainage meets

various requirements of several sets of regulations. Mr. Hultgren will be presenting this newest plan design to the Commission the following evening on May 19, 2015.

The Board received comment from Jerlyn Sponseller of 14 George Hill Road, an abutter to the project. She voiced her concerns about the impacts to the water quality of Miscoe Brook, which serves as a play area for her children as well as other children in the neighborhood. She presented the following questions to the Board:

- Will the water quality of Miscoe Brook be affected by the proposed subdivision?
- Will the common driveway impact the buffer zone for the brook and to what extent?
- The Miscoe Brook was determined to be a critical waterway. What tests are being done to ensure that the runoff from those driveways will not impact Miscoe Brook?

Mr. Hassinger responded to her concerns noting that these concerns are primary responsibility of the Conservation Commission, who take the evaluation of these areas quite seriously, with particular interest in to storm water runoff and buffering for no-disturb zones, including stream and wetlands. Mr. Laydon added that the legal requirements set forth by the Conservation Commission which prohibits disruption to the vegetation within 100 feet of wetlands as well as requirements for any disruption to the soil done within 200 feet of a waterway. These legal requirements will be set forth in the conditions section of the approval if it is granted by the Conservation Committee. Those conditions will speak directly to erosion control, drainage for common and private drives, as well as installation for septic systems, etc. Mr. Hultgren noted that Graves Engineering, the consulting firm hired by the Town to provide peer review for the site plan, has deemed the newly proposed plan as within DEP Regulations and the Town's local regulation for storm water runoff.

Ms. Sponseller added her concerns about the adding additional driveway openings along this stretch of road. She noted that there are a number of blind spots due to the alignment and condition of the road. Vehicles travel quickly down this road and it leads to unsafe conditions for those walking and running. She cited the newest driveway to the west of the site adding that it presents a hazard due to a blind spot at their driveway access point. She was concerned that the additional driveway cuts would serve to aggravate the situation.

The Board went on to discuss the nature of the applications and the requested waivers. Mr. Robbins noted that the final design presented requiring the waiver was a less complex layout and had less impervious surface. He felt that the Fire Department's comments were important and that public safety is a priority. Mr. Hassinger noted that one of the criteria for granting waivers was the consideration of unique circumstances of which this application presented several.

Mrs. Hassinger noted that three people on the Board, while not direct abutters, lived on George Hill Road and asked about the rules regarding conflict of interest. Mr. Robbins noted that there was no need for members to recuse themselves from this particular case. Mr. Hassinger reviewed the rule of necessity in the event that the Board cannot meet voting quorum on a case where too many members must recuse themselves in accordance with State regulations.

No additional public input was received.

MOTION by Mr. Hanna **SECOND** by Mrs. Hassinger to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft a decision based upon the information submitted and testimony received. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. REORGANIZATION

Mr. Robbins proposed that Reorganization of the Board be postponed until the June 22nd meeting due to Mr. Hanna's anticipated absence on June 8th. The Board reviewed the past practice of reorganizing at the first meeting after the local elections. However, it was his opinion that it was important to have the full membership of the Board present at the time of reorganization. Mr. Hassinger suggested that the Board consider other methods for reorganization since the process has not been set forth in any operating policy of the Board.

B. FUTURE BOARD WORKSHOPS

The Board agreed to plan a workshop as part of a regular meeting or schedule a separate meeting to review topics and ideas for zoning by-law amendments. There is a need to plan workshops for potential warrant articles for the October Town Meeting as well as planning content for next year's Town Meeting, e.g. a solar by-law, as well as amendments pertaining to kennels, portable signs, and the Water Supply Protection Overlay District. Mr. Robbins added that these topics, particularly a solar by-law, could potentially be under development by way of the summer intern. The Board determined that the next discussion on these topics should happen as soon as possible, and would like to begin the conversation at the next meeting on June 8th before the public hearing and continue any discussion after the public hearing as needed.

C. COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN

Grafton has undergone many changes and much economic growth since 2000. The last Master Plan was created approximately 15 years ago in 2000. The Town Administrator had proposed a warrant article for this past Town Meeting that would provide funding to update the Master Plan. The article was pulled from the warrant for a number of reasons one being that the Finance Committee raised concerns that the article was being advanced by the wrong department and without input and vetting by the Planning Board. There is continued interest by the Planning Department, the Town Administrator's office and the Economic Development Commission to move forward with developing a plan or plans that would provide a guide for the future. Mr. Hassinger notes that legally, a Town is mandated by the State to keep an updated master plan and that the plan should be updated every 5 years despite the fact that the State does not provide any funds to do so. The Planning Board agreed that the Master Plan should be spearheaded by the Planning Department along with Town consensus to make the Master Plan more applicable, useful and relevant. Mr. Robbins suggested that an updated Master Plan be developed in a way that is more useful, especially as we critique zoning bylaws and other growth opportunities. Mr. Laydon also pointed out that the more specific the scope of work for an updated Master Plan, the better use it can be.

MOTION to extend the meeting beyond 10:00 p.m. made by Mr. Scully, **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Robbins noted that it would be important to first assess if the current Master Plan needs to be completely rewritten or if some parts were still relevant. He'd like to see a document that would be useful as an ongoing guide to decision making by the Town for future projects. The update should prioritize work items. An update would be an opportunity to back check the vision and to engage the residents particularly since the Town has grown significantly since 2000. Mr. Laydon noted that since the last Plan was submitted there have been significant advancements in technology that will be very helpful.

MOTION by Mr. Hassinger **SECOND** by Mr. Hanna to direct staff to prepare a proposal for work the 2000 Comprehensive Master Plan update. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

D. TRANSPORTATION ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The Board tabled this item.

4. STAFF REPORT

The Planning Department is happy to have a fully staffed office. Several resumes have been collected for the Planning Internship position. In the following weeks interviews will be scheduled to fill the position for the start of June.

5. BILLS

The bills were circulated and signed.

6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

No minutes of previous meetings were presented.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

A. BUCKEYE PARTNERS LETTER OF OWNERSHIP

The Exxon Pipeline is now owned by Buckeye Partners. This petroleum pipeline crosses Rt. 140 over the Town line in Upton. It was noted that this correspondence came directly to the Planning office and was forwarded to the Office of the Town Administrator for their records.


8. REPORTS FROM PLANNING BOARD REPRESENTATIVES ON TOWN COMMITTEES AND CMRPC

No reports were heard at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Hanna **SECOND** by Mrs. Hassinger to adjourn the meeting. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.



Sargon Hanna, Clerk

EXHIBITS

- **Action Item 2B: Draft Decision – Major Special Permit (2014-4) – Bull Meadow Subdivision – Off 11 Appaloosa Drive, 109R Adams Road, and 81 Adams Road – Bull Meadow, LLC. (Applicant) – Massachusetts Department of Transportation (Owner)**
 - Draft Decision, Major Special Permit (SP 2014-4), dated May 16, 2015; 17 pages.
- **Item 7A: Correspondence - Buckeye Partners, L.P. – Letter of ownership and operation – Breinigsville, Pennsylvania – Buckeye Partners, L.P. (Owner)**
 - Correspondence from Buckeye Partners, L.P.; dated May 18, 2015; received and forwarded to the office of the Board of Selectmen for further distribution on May 18, 2015; 1 page.
- **Public Hearing 9A: Major Residential Special Permit (MRSP 2014-10) - 100 Westboro Road – D. & F. Afonso Builders (Applicant / Owner)**
 - Site map; no title, no date; 11" X 17", black & white; 1 page
- **Public Hearing 9B: Joint Hearing
Special Permit (SP 2015-6) & Site Plan Approval – Common Driveway Scenic Road Permit (SRP 2015-1) – 114 Merriam Road – Fred & Margot Churchill (Applicant/Owner)**
 - Correspondence, Grafton Fire Department; dated May 11, 2015, received May 12, 2015; 1 page.
 - Memorandum, Grafton Police Department.; dated May 1, 2015; received May 15, 2015; 2 pages.
 - Memorandum, Grafton Historical Commission; dated May 1, 2015; received May 15, 2015; 2 pages
 - Application for Special Permit; Frederic Churchill (Applicant/Owner); dated April 19, 2015, no received date; 1 page.
 - Application for a Hearing under the Scenic Road Bylaw; Frederic Churchill (Applicant/Owner); dated April 19, 2015, no received date; 1 page.
 - Correspondence; Quinn Engineering, Inc.; dated April 22, 2014; no received date; 9 pages.

- Plan Set: Lot Development Plan; 114 Merriam Road; prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc.; dated November 18, 2015; 11" X 17", black and white; includes the following:
 - C-0.0.....Cover Sheet
 - C-1.0.....Existing Conditions Plan
 - C-2.0.....Proposed Lot Layout Plan
 - C-3.0.....Proposed Lot Development Plan
 - C-4.0.....Erosion Control & Storm-water Pollution Prevention Plan
 - C-5.0.....Profile, Details & Notes
 - C-6.0.....Details and Notes
 - C-7.0.....Notes
 - C-8.0.....Concept Subdivision Plan
 - C-9.0.....Proposed Lot Development Plan (Conforming Plan)
- Memorandum, Quinn Engineering, Inc.; 114 Merriam Road Common Driveway; dated May 11, 2015, received May 12, 2015; 1 page.
- Correspondence, Graves Engineering, Inc.; 114 Merriam Road Common Driveway, Hydrology and Storm-water Management Review; dated May 8, 2015; received May 11, 2015; 3 pages

